

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00694 01 OF 04 151245Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-01 INR-07 IO-13  
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 PRS-01  
SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /087 W  
-----055347 151547Z /42

R 151202Z DEC 77  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2566  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0694

E.O. 11652: GDS  
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR  
SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF  
DECEMBER 14, 1977

1. FOLLOWING IS THE SUMMARY OF THE INFORMAL SESSION OF DECEMBER  
14, 1977:

BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE DECEMBER 14, 1977 INFORMAL SESSION  
OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE LAST OF THE ROUND, THE ALLIES WERE  
REPRESENTED BY THE NETHERLANDS, UK AND US REPRESENTATIVES AND  
THE EAST BY SOVIET REPRESENTATIVES TARASOV AND SHUSTOV, POLISH  
REP STRULAK AND CZECHOSLOVAK REP MEISNER. DURING THE SESSION,  
EAST AND WEST REVIEWED THE PAST ROUND, EACH POINTING OUT THE  
DEFECTS OF THE OTHER'S POSITION. BOTH EASTERN AND WESTERN  
REPRESENTATIVES ALSO MADE STATEMENTS PRESENTING THEIR VIEW OF  
THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE DATA ISSUE. THE EAST'S ARGUMENTATION  
WAS WELL ORGANIZED BUT NO MAJOR NEW POINTS EMERGED. END SUMMARY.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00694 01 OF 04 151245Z

2. THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL REPORTS THAT PORTION OF THE SESSION  
WHICH DEALT WITH DATA EXCHANGE. QUOTE:

3. TARASOV SAID THAT, IN THEIR STATEMENTS, THE CZECHOSLOVAK  
AND POLISH REPS HAD GIVEN THEIR EVALUATION OF THE ROUND NOW  
NEARING ITS COMPLETION AS THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES  
EVALUATED THAT ROUND AND HE DID NOT HAVE ANYTHING TO ADD

TO THIS EVALUATION. THERE WAS ONLY ONE FURTHER POINT WHICH WAS PROBABLY WORTH MENTIONING AT THIS TIME. THIS WAS THE EASTERN ATTITUDE TOWARDS DEVELOPMENTS IN THE DATA DISCUSSION ON WHICH UK REP HAD BRIEFLY TOUCHED. IN PARTICULAR, UK REP HAD REPEATED THE WESTERN THESIS THAT THE DISCREPANCY IN DATA SHOULD BE CLARIFIED BEFORE THE CONCLUSION OF AN AGREEMENT ON SUBSTANCE WOULD BECOME POSSIBLE. EASTERN REPS DID NOT AGREE IN PRINCIPLE WITH THIS AND THEY HAD QUITE ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW ON THIS SUBJECT. HOWEVER, EASTERN REPS AT THE SAME TIME DID NOT HAVE GROUNDS FOR REFUSING THE DATA DISCUSSION WHICH COULD HELP THE WEST TO IDENTIFY ITS MISTAKES IN COUNTING THE STRENGTH OF WARSAW TREATY FORCES.

4. TARASOV SAID HE DID NOT WISH AT PRESENT TO RECALL THE ENTIRE HISTORY OF THE DATA DISCUSSION. HE WISHED ONLY TO NOTE THAT THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS HAD ALREADY A MONTH AND A HALF EARLIER SUBMITTED THE WELL KNOWN COMPROMISE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00694 02 OF 04 151254Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-13  
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 PRS-01  
SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /087 W  
-----055429 151548Z /40

R 151202Z DEC 77  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2567  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0694

PROPOSAL CREATING ALL NECESSARY PRECONDITIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DATA EXCHANGE AND FOR THE COMPARISON AND CONSTRUCTIVE EVALUATION OF THIS DATA. THE SERIOUS AND BUSINESSLIKE NATURE OF THE ABOVE-MENTIONED PROPOSAL, ALSO RECOGNIZED BY THE WESTERN REPS, COULD CLEARLY BE SEEN FROM THE FOLLOWING FACTS: FIRST THIS PROPOSAL WAS A REAL COMPROMISE. IN FACT, IT PROPOSED EXCHANGING DATA ON THOSE CATEGORIES OF FORCES TO WHICH THE

WESTERN STATES THEMSELVES HAD REFERRED ON THE 15TH JULY OF THE PRESENT YEAR. THE EASTERN REPS DID NOT INSIST NOW ON THE DATA EXCHANGE OF DATA ON THE NATIONAL ARMED FORCE MANPOER, ALTHOUGH THEY WOULD PREFER EXACTLY SUCH AN APPROACH.

5. TARASOV CONTINUED THAT, SECOND, THE EASTERN PROPOSAL TOOK INTO ACCOUNT THE INTEREST OF THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS IN NOT DISCLOSING THE NATIONAL COMPOSITION OF THE NATO MULTILATERAL GROUND FORCE HEADQUARTERS AND PROVIDED IN THIS RESPECT FOR SUBMITTING THE MANPOWER OF THOSE HEADQUARTERS IN ONE FIGURE. THIRD, THIS PROPOSAL DID NOT SET FORTH ANY PRECONDITIONS OR DEMANDS PRE-DETERMINING IN ADVANCE THE FUTURE COURSE OF THE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00694 02 OF 04 151254Z

DATA DISCUSSION. FOURTH, THE PROPOSAL OF 25 OCTOBER PERMITTED CARRYING OUT WHAT THE WESTERN REPS CONSIDERED AS AN IMPORTANT THING--A MORE DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE GROUND FORCE MANPOWER OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, SINCE FOR EACH COUNTRY THOSE FORCES WOULD BE DIVIDED INTO TWO CATEGORIES, WHILE THE AIR FORCE DATA FOR EACH COUNTRY WOULD BE CONFINED ONLY TO ONE FIGURE. IF THE WESTERN COUNTRIES HAD CLEARLY STATED THAT THEY ACCEPTED THESE CLEAR PROPOSALS, WHICH TOOK GREATLY INTO ACCOUNT THEIR OWN POINT OF VIEW, AND HAD NOT SET FORTH VARIOUS RESERVATIONS AND PRECONDITIONS PERTAINING TO THE METHOD OF FURTHER DISCUSSIONS, PARTICIPANTS WOULD ALREADY BE DEALING AT PRESENT, NOT WITH THE PROCEDURAL ISSUES BUT RATHER WITH THE ANALYSIS OF SPECIFIC DATA ON FORCE MANPOER OF BOTH THE EASTERN AND WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANT COUNTRIES. ACCEPTANCE OF THE 25 OCTOBER COMPROMISE PROPOSALS WAS FURTHER FACILITATED FOR THE WESTERN REPS BY THE FACT THAT THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS DID NOT OBJECT, ALTHOUGH IT HAD NOT BEEN PROVIDED FOR IN THE OCTOBER 25 PROPOSAL, TO EXCHANGING DATA, ACCORDING TO THE DESIRES EXPRESSED BY THE WESTERN REPS ON THE OVERALL FIGURES FOR THE GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL IN MAJOR FORMATIONS, AS WELL AS FOR THE REMAINING PERSONNEL OF THE NATO AND WARSAW TREATY COUNTRIES, TAKEN AS A WHOLE. THIS ELEMENT WAS A NEW, SERIOUS CONCESSION TO THE WESTERN POSITION ON THE PART OF THE EAST, AND ONCE MORE DEMONSTRATED CONVINCINGLY THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE APPROACH OF THE EASTERN COUNTRIES AND THEIR READINESS TO DEVELOP THE DATA DISCUSSION IN A BUSINESSLIKE MANNER. IF WESTERN REPS HAD DISPLAYED ON THEIR PART THE SAME SERIOUSNESS AND RESPONSIBLE APPROACH TO THIS MATTER, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN POSSIBLE IN RECENT DAYS TO IMPROVE THE SITUATION AND TO PROCEED TO AN EARLIER DATA EXCHANGE.

6. TARASOV ASKED, WHAT WAS NEEDED FOR THIS? FIRST OF ALL THAT THE WESTERN REPS SHOULD HAVE CLEARLY STATED THEIR  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00694 02 OF 04 151254Z

ACCEPTANCE OF THE 25 OCTOBER COMPROMISE PROPOSAL AS A  
FRAMEWORK FOR THE EXCHANGE OF THE ADDITIONAL DATA FOR

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00694 03 OF 04 151315Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-01 INR-07 IO-13  
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 PRS-01  
SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /087 W  
-----055629 151551Z /40

R 151202Z DEC 77  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2568  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0694

THE MANPOWER AND MANNING LEVELS OF THE FORCES OF THE DIRECT  
PARTICIPANT STATES. THEN, FOR EACH COUNTRY, THERE COULD  
HAVE BEEN EXCHANGED DATA, THE CATEGORIES OF WHICH WERE ALREADY  
KNOWN IN PARCTICE. EASTERN REPS HAD REPEATEDLY STATED,  
AND WOULD LIKE TO REPEAT ON THE PRESENT OCCASION, THAT  
EASTERN PARTICIPANTS DID NOT HAVE ANY DIFFICULTIES WITH  
REGARD TO EXCHANGING SUCH FIGURES AND ALREADY POSSESSED THE  
CORRESPONDING DATA. WESTERN PARTICIPANTS WERE TELLING EASTERN  
PARTICIPANTS THAT THEY HAD DIVIDED AIR FORCE MANPOWER INTO  
TWO CATEGORIES. EASTERN PARTICIPANTS DID NOT SEE ANY  
COMPLICATING PROBLEMS HERE EITHER, AGREEING THAT THE WEST  
COULD SUBMIT AIR FORCE DATA FOR EACH NATO COUNTRY IN A FORM  
IT CONSIDERED MOST CONVENIENT FOR ITSELF. THE EAST'S AGREE-  
MENT TO ANY METHOD OF PRESENTATION BY NATO COUNTRIES OF  
THEIR AIR FORCE DATA DEMONSTRATED THAT THE EAST WAS NOT  
SEEKING IN ANY WAY TO PREJUDICE THE WESTERN POSITION. IF  
THE WESTERN COUNTRIES FOR THEIR PART ALSO DID NOT SEEK  
DELIBERATELY TO PREJUDICE THE POSITION OF THE EASTERN PARTICI-  
PANTS, THEN THEY TOO SHOULD NOT FEEL IT DIFFICULT TO ACCEPT

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00694 03 OF 04 151315Z

THE EAST'S PROPOSALS.

7. TARASOV CONTINUED THAT, IN OBJECTIVELY ANALYZING THE SITUATION CREATED IN THE DATA EXCHANGE ISSUE, ONE COULD NOT BUT DRAW A CONCLUSION THAT DELAY IN SUCH AN EXCHANGE WAS ACTUALLY ONLY DUE TO THE POSITION OF THE WESTERN STATES WHO IN THEIR REPLY OF NOVEMBER 9 HAD IN FACT COMPLICATED THE WHOLE ISSUE. EASTERN REPS HAD ALREADY BEEN COMPELLED TO STATE THIS BEFORE. THE REASON FOR SUCH COMPLICATIONS WERE: THE ATTEMPTS TO CONNECT THE DATA EXCHANGE TO THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF JULY 15, TO GAIN AIR FORCE DATA PRESENTED IN A FORM WHICH THE WEST PROPOSED, AND TO PREDETERMINE IN ADVANCE THE COURSE OF DISCUSSION IN A DIRECTION OF A TYPE WHICH WAS UNACCEPTABLE FOR THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS.

8. TARASOV CONTINUED THAT, UNDER THESE CIRCUMSTANCES, THE WORDS OF UK REP AT THE 29 NOVEMBER INFORMAL SESSION TO THE EFFECT THAT THE EASTERN SIDE WAS ALLEGEDLY EXPERIENCING CERTAIN DIFFICULTIES PREVENTING IT FROM PROCEEDING TO DATA EXCHANGE AND THAT THE WESTERN REPS WANTED TO HELP THE EAST TO OVERCOME THESE DIFFICULTIES, SOUNDED RATHER INCOMPREHENSIBLE AND STRANGE TO EASTERN PARTICIPANTS. AS EASTERN REPS HAD ALREADY DEMONSTRATED IN THE SESSION, SUCH HELP WAS NEEDED BY THE WESTERN REPS THEMSELVES AND EASTERN REPS HAD PROVIDED THE WEST WITH SUCH ASSISTANCE. WESTERN REPS SHOULD PUT ASIDE EVERYTHING THAT HAMPERED PROCEEDING TO A PRODUCTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE FORCE MANPOWER ISSUE AND ACCEPT THE SIMPLEST AND MOST REASONABLE SOLUTION. THAT WAS, TO AGREE WITH THE COMPROMISE PROPOSED BY THE EAST WHICH ENSURED A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE METHOD OF DATA DISCUSSION. BY THE WAY, AS EVERYONE KNEW, IN THE FIRST WEEK OF DECEMBER, THE REPS OF BOTH SIDES HAD ELABORATED IN AN INFORMAL WAY A WORKING  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00694 03 OF 04 151315Z

PAPER PROVIDING A NECESSARY AND CAREFULLY BALANCED BASIS FOR DATA EXCHANGE. THIS DOCUMENT VERY SCRUPULOUSLY TOOK INTO ACCOUNT THE INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES. HOWEVER, IT TOO WAS THEN ALSO REJECTED BY THE WESTERN REPS, ALTHOUGH IT

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00694 04 OF 04 151514Z  
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-01 INR-07 IO-13  
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 PRS-01  
SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 /087 W  
-----056973 151546Z /40

R 151202Z DEC 77  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2569  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO USMISSION USNATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 4 MBFR VIENNA 0694

HAD BEEN WORKED OUT JOINTLY WITH WESTERN REPS. EASTERN REPS  
COULD REGARD SUCH A POSITION OF WESTERN REPS ONLY AS A  
MANEUVER AIMED AT DELAYING THE DATA EXCHANGE WITH THE  
INTENTION TO BLAME THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES AFTERWARDS FOR THEIR  
ALLEGED EVASION OF THE DATA DISCUSSION OF THE FORCES OF THE  
SIDES IN CENTRAL EUROPE. IF THIS WAS NOT SO, THEN IT COULD  
POSSIBLY MEAN THAT THE WESTERN COUNTRIES INTENDED TO COMPLETELY  
REJECT THE EASTERN COMPROMISE PROPOSAL OF 25 OCTOBER 1977  
AND TO SEEK FOR A CONTINUATION OF DATA DISCUSSION EXCLUSIVELY  
ON THE BASIS OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF JULY 15, WHICH COULD  
NOT BE ACCEPTED BY THE EASTERN STATES FOR THE REASONS THEY HAD  
REPEATEDLY EXPLAINED.

9. TARASOV CONTINUED THESE WERE THE REACTIONS OF THE SOVIET  
DELEGATION AND HE BELIEVED THEY REFLECTED THE POINT OF VIEW OF  
ALL EASTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AS REGARDS THE STATE OF AFFAIRS  
IN THE DISCUSSION OF DATA EXCHANGE.

10. US REP SAID HE ALSO WISHED TO SAY A FEW WORDS ABOUT THE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00694 04 OF 04 151514Z

DISCUSSION OF THE PAST WEEKS DESIGNED TO TRY TO SOLVE THIS PROBLE.  
HE HOPED THEY WOULD BE HELPFUL IN CLARIFYING THE ISSUE AND IN  
FINDING A SOLUTION BECAUSE HE SERIOUSLY THOUGHT THAT THIS WAS  
NOT THE TIME TO LOOK BACK TO THE PAST AND TO ASSESS THE BLAME

FOR HOW PARTICIPANTS HAD GOTTEN INTO THIS SITUATION BUT  
RATHER TO FIND A SOLUTION TO IT AND TO MOVE ON.

11. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP,  
US REP SAID THAT IN PAST WEEKS, PARTICIPANTS HAD BEEN  
DISCUSSING SOME POSSIBLE STATEMENTS WHICH WESTERN REPS UNDERSTOOD  
THE EAST DESIRED BEFORE PROCEEDING TO THE PRESENTATION OF THE  
DATA WHOSE EXCHANGE HAD BEEN AGREED. NOW THAT ALL THE DETAILS  
OF THE PRESENT DATA EXCHANGE HAD BEEN AGREED ON, AS SOVIET REP  
HAD JUST CONFIRMED, WESTERN REPS WISHED TO REMIND THE EAST  
THAT THEY WERE READY TO PROCEED IMMEDIATELY WITH THE EXCHANGE  
OF DATA WITHOUT FURTHER DISCUSSION AND WITHOUT ANY STATEMENT.

12. US REP STATED THAT THE WEST WOULD ALSO BE PREPARED TO  
PROCEED TO THE EXCHANGE ON THE BASIS OF A SIMPLE STATEMENT,  
AGREED TO BY BOTH SIDES, THAT NONE OF THE PARTICIPANTS HAD  
ENTERED INTO ANY COMMITMENTS, WHETHER DIRECT OR INDIRECT, AS  
REGARDS PROPOSING OR ACCEPTING FURTHER EXCHANGE OF DATA OTHER  
THAN THAT WHICH HAD BEEN UNDER DISCUSSION. IF THE EAST'S CONCERN  
WAS IMPLICATIONS AS TO THE FUTURE, THEN SUCH A SIMPLE  
STATEMENT SHOULD DEAL WITH THEM.

13. US REP SAID THAT WESTERN REPS WISHED TO NOTE THAT THEY HAD  
ALSO BEEN WILLING TO DISCUSS AN ORAL STATEMENT LIMITED TO A  
FACTUAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DATA TO BE EXCHANGED. HOWEVER, SUCH  
A STATEMENT MUST BE BALANCED AND MUST NOT PROVIDE A BASIS FOR  
FUTURE CLAIMS THAT THE WEST HAD AGREED TO LIMIT THE SCOPE OF  
FUTURE DISCUSSIONS. IN OTHER WORDS, THIS APPROACH, WHICH WOULD  
BE BASED ON THE IDEA OF LEAVING THE FUTURE TO TAKE CARE OF  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00694 04 OF 04 151514Z

ITSELF, MUST GENUINELY DO SO. IN THIS REGARD, WESTERN REPS  
THOUGHT THAT IT WAS RELEVANT TO RECALL TO PARTICIPANTS THAT,  
AS HAD BEEN AGREED IN THE PREPARATORY TALKS, EACH SIDE HAD THE  
RIGHT TO RAISE ANY TOPIC RELEVANT TO THE SUBJECT MATTER. ON THE  
ASSUMPTION THAT EASTERN PARTICIPANTS MIGHT STILL BE INTERESTED  
IN A STATEMENT ALONG THE LINES THEY HAD SUGGESTED, WESTERN REPS  
WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT THAT ANY STATEMENT SHOULD EITHER BE  
WITHOUT MENTION OF THE PAST PROPOSALS OF EITHER SIDE, OR  
ALTERNATIVELY, IT SHOULD BE PHRASED IN A WAY WHICH SPECIFICALLY  
REFERRED TO THE PROPOSALS MADE BY BOTH SIDES. UNQUOTE RESOR

SECRET

NNN





## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** INFORMATION EXCHANGE, MEETING REPORTS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 15-Dec-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977MBFRV00694  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D770467-0410  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t19771253/aaaabsqs.tel  
**Line Count:** 377  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 87346d03-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 7  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 24-Nov-2004 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 226028  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF DECEMBER 14, 1977  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/87346d03-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009